

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 have been amended to improve format. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are pending. Applicants respectfully assert that amended claims 1-11 do not introduce new matter.

Claim Interpretation

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner invokes provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, and interprets the features recited by claims 1 and 9 to be commensurate with Applicants' disclosure. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed "means," as recited by claims 1 and 9, are not necessarily limited to the interpretations cited by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 are objected to for minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 12 in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1-13 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 3 in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 3, as amended, complies with the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

On pages 2 to 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over various combinations of Nakamura et al. (US 5,423,914), Tomofuji (US 6,142,097), Bernard et al. (US 2002/0153102), Columbo (US 5,951,767), Nyberg et al. (US 4,654,231), Demay et al. (4,813,373), and Takahashi (US 5,588,999). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action acknowledges that Nakamura et al. discloses a partitioning plate 21 having only a single opening closed by a gate valve 22. Here, Nakamura et al. explicitly requires the single opening at a center of the partitioning plate 21 to ensure that a beam emitted from K cells 3 toward the substrate 4 is not obstructed by the partitioning plate 21. Accordingly, the Office Action alleges that only a nominal revision of Nakamura et al. would be required to include at least two recesses in the partitioning plate 21 of Nakamura et al. As an example, the Office Action cites Tomofuji for allegedly teaching use of a diaphragm plate 4 having round apertures 5a-c, each respectively corresponding to vaporization sources 10a-c, to control the diffusion direction of the vaporized particles. Thus, the Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the required single opening of Nakamura et al. to include additional openings "to achieve the predictable result of controlling the

direction and quantity of material passing therethrough." Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Applicants respectfully assert that Nakamura et al. is completely silent with regard to a wall that includes "recesses, each being centered on the main axis of one of the sources of material having the main axis," and "the chamber contains means for plugging or clearing each of said recesses." Although the Office Action relies upon the shutter 9 of Nakamura et al. to allegedly anticipate Applicants' claimed "means for plugging or clearing each of said recesses," Applicants respectfully assert that Nakamura et al. merely discloses the use of a single gate valve 22 to closing the opening of the partitioning plate 21, whereas Tomofuji is completely silent with regard to any device for sealing the round apertures 5a-c. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the applied prior art references, whether taken singly or combined with either Nakamura et al. or Tomofuji, teach or suggest Applicants' claimed wall having recesses, as well as means for plugging and clearing each of the recesses, as explicitly required by independent claim 1.

Second, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the applied prior art references, whether taken singly or combined with either Nakamura et al. or Tomofuji, teach or suggest Applicants' a means for plugging and clearing recesses that can be controlled individually to protect the sources of material having a main

evaporation axis unused. Here, Applicants respectfully assert that Nakamura et al. merely discloses a single gate valve to close the single opening to completely shut-off molecular flows between the first and second sub-chambers, and Tomofuji is completely silent with regard to *individually controlling* a device for sealing the round apertures 5a-c. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the applied prior art, whether taken singly or combined with either Nakamura et al. or Tomofuji, teach or suggest means for plugging and clearing recesses that can be controlled individually to protect the sources of material having a main evaporation axis unused.

Third, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the applied prior art of record establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to at least independent claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Nakamura et al., Tomofuji, Bernard et al., Columbo, Nyberg et al., Demay et al., and Takahashi are each completely silent with regard to the combined features recited by independent claim 1. Here, Applicants respectfully assert that none of Nakamura et al., Tomofuji, Bernard et al., Columbo, Nyberg et al., Demay et al., and Takahashi, whether taken individually or in any combination, teach or suggest an evaporation chamber including: (1) a wall having recesses centered on a main axis of a sources of material having a main axis; (2) means for plugging or clearing each of the recesses; and (3) the means being

controlled individually to protect the sources of material having a main evaporation axis unused. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that although some of the applied prior art may teach or suggest some of the features recited by independent claim 1, none of the applied prior art, in any combination, teaches the combined features recited by independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Nakamura et al., Tomofuji, Bernard et al., Columbo, Nyberg et al., Demay et al., and Takahashi, taken in any combination(s), fail to render Applicants' claimed invention *prima facie* obvious. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

This Response is believed to be fully responsive and to place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the Amendment, and an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Should the Examiner believe that any matters need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/David B. Hardy/

David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

DBH/fb